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The aff must prove that affirming the principle stated by the resolution is better justified than negating it. But there are different kinds of justification. Most reasons for accepting a principle have to do with epistemic evidence for the principle’s truth, but we can also have pragmatic reasons for belief. Jordan:

Jeff Jordan, [Professor of Philosophy at the University of Delaware],  "Pragmatic Arguments and Belief in God", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2011 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2011/entries/pragmatic-belief-god/>. JMN

As with so much in philosophy, the first recorded employment of a pragmatic argument is found in Plato. At *Meno* 86b-c, Socrates tells Meno that believing in the value of inquiry is justified because of the positive impact upon one's character: Meno: Somehow or other I believe you are right. Socrates: I think I am. I shouldn't like to take my oath on the whole story, but one thing I am ready to fight for as long as I can, in word and act—that is, that we shall be better, braver, and more active men if we believe it right to look for what we don't know than if we believe there is no point in looking because what we don't know we can never discover. Meno: There too I am sure you are.[[1](http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/pragmatic-belief-god/notes.html" \l "1)] Paraphrased, Socrates' point is if being better, braver, and more active are among our desires, and if believing that inquiry is permissible facilitates our becoming better, braver, and more active, then we have reason, pragmatic reason, to believe that inquiry is permissible. Socrates' argument is an argument for the permissibility of a certain belief, based on the benefits of believing that certain belief. Pragmatic arguments are practical in orientation, justifying actions that are thought to facilitate the achievement of our goals, or the satisfaction of our desires. If among your goals is A, and if doing such and such results in your achieving A, then, all else being equal, you have reason to do such and such: Doing α brings about, or contributes in bringing about, β, and It is in your interest that β obtain. So, you have reason to do α. As presented this is a particular kind of pragmatic argument, a prudential argument. Prudential pragmatic arguments are predicated upon one's preferences or goals or self-interest. As we will see, there are pragmatic arguments that are not narrowly prudential but are moral in nature. Pragmatic arguments are relevant to belief-formation, since inculcating a belief is an action. There are, broadly speaking, two kinds of pragmatic arguments that have to do with belief-formation. The first is an argument that recommends taking steps to believe a proposition because, if it should turn out to be true, the benefits gained from believing that proposition will be impressive. This first kind of pragmatic argument we can call a “truth-dependent” pragmatic argument, or more conveniently a “dependent-argument,” since the benefits are obtained only if the relevant state of affairs occurs. The prime example of a dependent-argument is a pragmatic argument that uses a calculation of expected utility and employs the Expectation Rule to recommend belief: whenever both probability and utility values are known, one should choose to do an act which has the greatest expected utility. Among the various versions of his wager argument, Pascal employs this Rule in a version which states that no matter how small the probability that God exists, as long as it is a positive, non-zero probability, the expected utility of theistic belief will dominate the expected utility of disbelief. Given the distinction between (A) having reason to think a certain proposition is true, and (B) having reason to induce belief in that proposition, taking steps to generate belief in a certain proposition may be the rational thing to do, even if that proposition lacks sufficient evidential support. The benefits of believing a proposition can rationally take precedence over the evidential strength enjoyed by a contrary proposition; and so, given an infinite expected utility, Pascal's Wager contends that forming the belief that God exists is the rational thing to do, no matter how small the likelihood that God exists.

Those pragmatic reasons can be about the consequences of our beliefs but also about the language used to state them. Representations of our language affect our ability to act effectively and interact with others. Haste writes:

Helen Haste, [PhD of Psychology at the University of Bath], “Communitarianism and the Social Construction of Morality”, 1998. NC

Communitarian thinkersstart from a very different psychological tradition. They emphasise the **primacy of language and social interaction in the generation of meaning [is important]**. Taylor argues that **human life is ‘fundamentally dialogic …. We become full human agents, capable of understanding ourselves, and hence defining an identity, through our acquisition of rich human languages of expression.**’ (1991 p 32). This aligns the communitarian ontological position with social constructionists like John Shotter (1993) and Rom HarrZ (HarrZ and Gillett, 1994) who argue that the primary human reality is face-to-face conversation. **If social interaction is the crucible of meaning, then the child learns about morality through discourse and through social practices**, both explicit and implicit. **The ‘meaning’ of something – including the meaning of our own identity and our morality – depends on what is comprehensible and recognized within our social community. Social beings create their identity through shared discourse and language** (Shotter, 1993). Communities are multiple; we are members of many communities which each offer us identity, and personal meaning, and within each different elements and skills are salient. Cultural narratives, stories and traditions feed directly into our identity, signaling valued attributes and behaviours, and giving an explanation for our past and present. Crucially, we also recognize that these are shared by those whom we thus define as members of our community. A moral obligation can only have meaning within a social context. Richard Shweder describes taboos and practices found amongst rural Hindus in India which are quite morally meaningless to Americans, because they are associated with beliefs about pollution which are not shared (Shweder et al, 1987). However practices may be widely condemned, but for different reasons – believing that rape is wrong because it defiles the victim’s purity, is very different from seeing it as wrong because treats her as an object rather than a person.

We have pragmatic reasons to reject the principle of the resolution’s use of the phrase “repeated domestic violence”.

The counter-advocacy is to reject the victim’s use of deadly force in situations of repeated domestic violence and embrace the victim’s use of deadly force in situations of ongoing coercive control.

First, the domestic violence model assumes that women cannot leave because of physical assault, but conceals the oppressive aspect of abuse, translating into disastrous consequences for victims. Stark:

Evan Stark, [Professor of Human Services and Chair, Department of Urban Health Administration at Rutgers University], *Coercive Control: How Men Entrap Women in Personal Life*, Oxford University Press, 2007. BB

**The limits of current interventions can be directly traced to a failure of vision, not of nerve.** Conservatives attack the advocacy movement for exaggerating the nature and extent of abuse. In fact, because of [the domestic violence model’s] its singular emphasis on physical violence, the prevailing model minimizes both the extent of women’s entrapment by male partners in personal life and its consequences. Viewing woman abuse through the prism **of** the **incident-specific** and injury-based definition of violence has concealed its major components, dynamics, and effects, including the fact **that** it is neither “domestic” nor primarily about “violence.” Failure to appreciate the multidimensionality of oppression in personal life has been disastrous for abuse victims. Regardless of its chronic nature, courts treat each abuse incident they see as a first offense. Because well over 95% of these incidents are minor, in that the physical assault involved is not injurious, almost no one goes to jail. In custody or divorce cases, because abuse is framed as incident specific or as only involving injurious violence, when women or children present with claims based on the ongoing, multidimensional and cumulative nature of abuse, these are often treated as fabricated. Worse, a protective mother may be blamed when her expressed level of concern or fear is at odds with evidence of assault: in the dependency court, her children may be placed in foster care; in family court, she is alleged to be engaged in alienating her children from the “good enough father.” As calls to the police or visits to the emergency room are repeated over time, the helping response becomes more perfunctory and may actually contribute to making abuse routine, a process called normalization.

Two implications. A] Solves for DV --- framing is crucial to preventing ongoing abuse B] Turns the case because aff perpetuates abuse.

Second, “coercive control” acknowledges the oppressive and cumulative aspect of intimate terrorism that “domestic violence” bluntly ignores. Stark 2:

**T**he easiest way to understand coercive control is to contrast it to the widespread equation of partner abuse with “domestic violence.” Domestic violence laws and most research in the field take an incident-specific focus and weigh the severity of abuse by the level of force used or injury inflicted, what I call a “calculus of harms.” In marked contrast, the coercive control model relies on evidence that most battered women who seek help experience coercion as “ongoing” rather than as merely “repeated” and that the main marker of these assaults is their frequency or even their “routine” nature rather than their severity, a fact that gives abuse a “cumulative” effect found in no other assault crime. Physical harm and psychological trauma remain important in the coercive control model. **But [the coercive control]** its **theory** of harms **replaces the violation of physical integrity with an emphasis on violations of “liberty” that entail the deprivation of rights and resources essential to personhood and citizenship.** In this view, the psychological language of victimization and dependence is replaced by the political language of domination, resistance, and subordination. . In the coercive control model, what men do *to* women is less important than what they prevent women from doing for themselves.

This turns the case because “repeated domestic violence” contributes to a culture that is hostile to victims.

Permutation can’t solve- the mention of violence blinds us to the oppression involved so the permutation would still link. Stark:

Evan Stark, [Professor of Human Services and Chair, Department of Urban Health Administration at Rutgers University], *Coercive Control: How Men Entrap Women in Personal Life*, Oxford University Press, 2007. BB

Control: Invisible in Plain Sight The victims and perpetrators of coercive control are easily identified. Many of the rights violated in battering are so fundamental to the conduct of everyday life that is hard to conceive of meaningful human existence without them. How is it possible then that it has attracted so little attention? I have already pointed to the prominence of the domestic violence model. Another explanation is the compelling nature of violence. Once injury became the major medium for presenting abuse, its sights and sounds were so dramatic that other experiences seemed muted by comparison. The radical feminists who led the fight against rape and pornography also inadvertently contributed to the invisibility of coercive control. Placing so much political currency on violence against women as the ultimate weapon in men’s arsenal made it a surrogate for male domination rather than merely one of its means. It was a short step to replacing the political discussions of women’s liberation with the talks of “victims” and “perpetrators.” Another explanation for why coercive control has had such little impact is that no one knows what to do about it.

The role of the ballot is to question the affirmative’s rhetorical choices --- naming of domestic violence is dire to public response and conceptualizing violence. Fountain et al-

Kim Fountain et al [PH.D, Deputy Director New York City Anti-Violence Project], "Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer Domestic violence in the united states in 2008" The National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs www.avp.org/documents/2008NCAVPLGBTQDVReportFINAL.pdf FD

**The naming of domestic violence is important not only in identifying and claiming the issue to be of serious public importance and thus the target of a public response, but also in the meanings and potential implications of the language used**. For instance, Itzin (2000) suggests that “how violence is conceptualized and defined will determine what is visible and seen and known . . . and what is and is not done about it through policy and practice**”** (p. 357). Similarly, **the ways in which domestic violence is named, even the very terms used, can have specific implications with regard to whose experience is named and whose is not**.

# \*\*Frontlines\*\*

# 2NR

The role of the ballot is to question the affirmative’s rhetorical choices prefer my link evidence

A) Comparative – despite the general tendency to underestimate the significance of what is said by claiming it’s mere rhetoric, interrogation of words is essential b/c it determines our ability to communicate effectively with others. That is the starting point of our ability to reason effectively and be good decision makers.

B) Specificity – only my evidence assumes the importance of analyzing the affirmative’s rhetorical choices when terms are vague and ambiguous.

C) You should have a higher credence in my arguments --- my evidence isolates empirical and analytical warrants. That’s the fountain and Rivera evidence. This means I have the strongest and most unique link to the discourse impact – using the word domestic violence will negatively affect the ability of everyone to communicate effectively.

D) Conclusive – Failure to examine the use of the word domestic violence entrenches the public/private sphere dichotomy, creating a cycle of violence immuning the act from law.

And, prefer the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ ev over their undeveloped analytics.

NOW IT’S TIME FOR FRAMEWORK COMPARISON.

Discourse impact comes first. – Hold them to the \_\_\_\_ analytics they made to the haste ev in the 1AR. NO NEW ARGUMENTS.

Prefer specificity --- all my impact cards are unique reasons why focusing on the definition of domestic violence is crucial to solving abuse.

A] The language associated with Intimate partner violence is more precise compared to domestic violence. --- these definitions are crucial to solve abuse and ensure victims are protected. Fountain et al -

Kim Fountain et al [PH.D, Deputy Director New York City Anti-Violence Project], "Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer Domestic violence in the united states in 2008" The National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs www.avp.org/documents/2008NCAVPLGBTQDVReportFINAL.pdf FD

Definitions are important because without a clear understanding of what domestic violence is, it can be difficult for survivors to determine if they are experiencing domestic violence. **Providers who do not share a definition of domestic violence may refuse to recognize this violence in LGBTQ relationships and opt to deny services**. Further, **without a nuanced understanding of the unique aspects of LGBTQ domestic violence, providers may choose to adopt a „one size fits all‟ mentality where they claim to deliver services to all equally when LGBTQ survivors are not actually receiving culturally competent or equal services**. Despite dilemmas regarding definitions, **they are important as they help to frame and name acts of violence and to hold perpetrators of such violence accountable**.

B] Naming of domestic violence is dire to public response and conceptualizing violence. Fountain 2 -

Kim Fountain et al [PH.D, Deputy Director New York City Anti-Violence Project], "Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer Domestic violence in the united states in 2008" The National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs www.avp.org/documents/2008NCAVPLGBTQDVReportFINAL.pdf FD

**The naming of domestic violence is important not only in identifying and claiming the issue to be of serious public importance and thus the target of a public response, but also in the meanings and potential implications of the language used**. For instance, Itzin (2000) suggests that “how violence is conceptualized and defined will determine what is visible and seen and known . . . and what is and is not done about it through policy and practice**”** (p. 357). Similarly, **the ways in which domestic violence is named, even the very terms used, can have specific implications with regard to whose experience is named and whose is not**.

C] This analysis of discourse is a prerequisite to taking any action and accesses your offense- it allows us to actually help victims in need.

Smith and Bell:

Phillipa Smith and Alan Bell [Philippa Smith is a PhD in discourses in national identity at AUT University in New Zealand, Allan Bell is Allan Bell is Professor of Language & Communication and the Director of the Institute of Culture, Discourse & Communication at Auckland University of Technology], “Unraveling the Web of Discourse Analysis” <http://www.aut.ac.nz/resources/research/research_institutes/ccr/sage_proofs_05-devereux-ch-04.pdf>

Foucault’s interest in the power play of specific discourses over society has influenced the postmodern connection between language and social structure (Devereux, 2003). This is echoed by Fairclough when referring to discursive practice contributing not just to the reproduction of society (‘social identities, social relationships, systems of knowledge and belief’), but also to the transformation of society (1992: 65). **Analysis of texts also enables identification of the representation, identity and stereotyping of groups and individuals. It allows for critical analysis, an awareness of persuasive language, and uncovers dominating social powers behind discourses.** Such critical analysis **[this] might not solve problems**, **but** it **is a prerequisite that has the ability to identify and analyze situations, and perhaps suggest ways of alleviating or resolving them** (Fairclough et al., 2004). The New Zealand Government, for example, recognized that promotional texts used by tobacco companies carried tempting lifestyle messages to influence, particularly, young people’s behaviour and their attitudes towards smoking. As a result, tobacco and advertising sponsorships were banned in the 1990s (Health NZ, 2005). A burgeoning of text types in society, largely brought about through developing technologies, compels researchers to seek understanding of social reality through analyzing the discourse of the texts and questioning them. Legal documents, advertisements, political and Government papers, company newsletters, propaganda leaflets, articles in newspapers, magazines, and books, television, radio and film, music and lyrics, performing arts and more recently the Internet, mobile phones, mobile television and computer games: these are just some examples of the proliferation of texts. Added to this are the changing and merging of existing discourses through processes of globalization of discourses and discourse genres (Fairclough, 2001).

D) Representations of our language affect our ability to act effectively, have goals and values, and generate positive norms. Haste[[1]](#footnote-1)

My message has been that we must conceptually separate out issues of values from issues of psychological processes; **it is not enough to have a set of values, we must understand how they can most effectively be inculcated.** For moral education to succeed **we must start not with the telos of values, but with recognising how we conceptualise the processes into which we wish to intervene**. Unfortunately, moral education curricula tend to reflect an eclectic, essentially commonsense, 'moral' package, which rarely starts from an explicit theory of how development takes place . The exception is programmes directly arising from Kohlberg's model, where we can see the dynamic relationship between ontology and advocacy. The emphasis on cognition led to two rather different types of educational programmes. In the 'Socratic' technique, challenges to existing schemas are facilitated through discussion and opportunities for reflection - mainly in a classroom context. Much more ambitious is the 'just community'. Whereas the Socratic method concentrates almost entirely on individual cognitive processes, the just community takes account of social practices - explicitly, that there is no point trying to stimulate individual cognition if all the behaviour, interactions and institutional structures surrounding the individual enact a lower stage of moral reasoning. The just communities had three agendas; to create a democratic environment, to foster social interaction and reflection that promoted cognitive stimulation, and to make sure that the consequences of the group's decisions were a real experience. I am not aware of any explicitly 'communitarian' education agenda, only of general goals. I therefore start from first principles in writing a blueprint, and in doing so, I shall spell out explicitly how values interweave with assumptions about psychological processes. First, let us recap on the principles for consideration: ~ the theoretical presumption is that **people are social beings who generate meaning through discourse and social interaction**, and through cultural repertoires**, stories and scripts transmitted by social practices and narratives.** It follows that: ~ **the desirable goals are values that will promote**

# AT Perm do both

1] Permutation can’t solve- the mention of violence always comes at a tradeoff b/c it blinds us to the oppression involved so the permutation would still link. Stark:

Evan Stark, [Professor of Human Services and Chair, Department of Urban Health Administration at Rutgers University], *Coercive Control: How Men Entrap Women in Personal Life*, Oxford University Press, 2007. BB

Control: Invisible in Plain Sight The victims and perpetrators of coercive control are easily identified. Many of the rights violated in battering are so fundamental to the conduct of everyday life that is hard to conceive of meaningful human existence without them. How is it possible then that it has attracted so little attention? I have already pointed to the prominence of the domestic violence model. Another explanation is the compelling nature of violence. Once injury became the major medium for presenting abuse, its sights and sounds were so dramatic that other experiences seemed muted by comparison. The radical feminists who led the fight against rape and pornography also inadvertently contributed to the invisibility of coercive control. Placing so much political currency on violence against women as the ultimate weapon in men’s arsenal made it a surrogate for male domination rather than merely one of its means. It was a short step to replacing the political discussions of women’s liberation with the talks of “victims” and “perpetrators.” Another explanation for why coercive control has had such little impact is that no one knows what to do about it.

2] Doesn’t avoid the link – the mere use of the term “domestic” insulates violence against women from state intervention programs and domesticizes the situation – that’s the rivera evidence.

3] Evaluate this perm from an offense/defense perspective---ANY RISK of a link means you vote NEG

No such thing as zero risk---there is always a chance that the term “domestic” will trigger the impacts---when there is a Counterplan that solves the whole case, you defer to accepting even low probability DA—key to good decisionmaking.

4] Perm doesn’t solve -- the continued use the term domestic violence prevents our ability to communicate effectively, destroying discourse. Louise:

Mary Louise, journalist with the *London Morning Paper*, 4 (http://www.newswithviews.com/guest\_opinion/guest32.htm)

**Doublethink**, or reality control, **involves being aware of truthfulness**, **while at the same time professing carefully devised lies and believing both**, as our so-called leaders aptly demonstrate. **Political language is designed to make lies sound truthful, and to convey the opposite of actual intentions, in order to greatly influence public opinion**. **Politically correct terminology is the invention of a simplified new vocabulary that masks,** distorts, and alters **the true meanings of traditional definitions**. It **limits the range of ideas and emotions that are allowed to be expressed, and causes unnecessary confusion and conflict that restricts understanding, which makes it difficult to communicate rationally and effectively**. Control of language and information is necessary to condition citizens to love their oppressors, appreciate censorship, and tolerate brutality. Freedom is slavery, war is peace, and ignorance is strength. As George Washington said, "In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened." In the words of George Orwell..."Doublethink means the power of holding two contradictory beliefs in one's mind simultaneously, and accepting both of them." "1984" is his most famous work, in which a surveillant State enforces conformity through constant indoctrination, fear, lies, and punishment. It was out of the chaos of wars that the Party seized control. This novel introduced the concept of Big Brother and Newspeak, the fictional language that is supposed to eclipse Oldspeak (the existing English language), by the year 2050. The notion was to remove politically incorrect ideas in a vocabulary of dichotomies, euphemisms, and abbreviations. By doing so, making nonconformist thoughts a crime and free speech impossible, in a dreary Totalitarian State, where people cannot resist tyranny, and will surrender liberty for security. Not actually used in the book, "doublespeak" is related to "doubletalk" and the apparent combination of doublethink and newspeak. According to Orwell, "Thoughtcrime is the essential crime that contains all others in itself." The Orwellian concept of crimethink means to doubt the principles of Ingsoc, or even consider any thought that questions official state policy. Ingsoc, or English Socialism, is basically a modern political system of Oligarchical Collectivism, that reflects Stalinism with Machiavellian overtones. "Hate Crime" legislation fits right in with the Orwellian scenario, as the thought police patrol our neighborhoods.

5) The alternative solves 100% of the case debate that means you weigh the net benefit to the alternative vs solvency deficits to the alternative. Too bad there are NO solvency deficits which means a risk of offense on why individuals is bad means you negate.

6) They are reading no evidence on this question on why using both words is good or will solve. Err neg on this issue – multiple authors conclude use of the word intimate partner is good and using both words is bad.

# AT Perm Do the CP

[Severance is always bad because then there’s no stable advocacy to argue against, making the 1AR entirely unpredictable and the 1NC functionally useless, which is the epitome of strategy skew and ruins any hope of meaningful clash in round. Clash is important because it increases our advocacy skills and ability to defend things, which is the only portable impact from debate- nothing else stays with us once we leave the room.]

# AT Language is Fluid

# At “Not responsible for words in the resolution”

# AT “Adopt Connotation”

1. Yeah that might be great, but that was not the framing in the 1AC. Once it’s out there you can’t take it back- it was still a rhetorical speech act and I am winning reasons why it’s prohibited
2. In order to account for oppression he would have to change the definition of violence beyond recognition- my argument is that violence causes a focus on the immediate and severe injuries, which doesn’t let us acknowledge the subtle aspect of cumulative oppression. That is how violence is overwhelmingly defined in society- he needs to be reading specific solvency about how that could happen. He only has generic, warrantless cards.

# At “Paralyzes Action”

# AT “Censorship”

# At “Confronting Bad words is key to Change”

# Link Ext Ev

The rhetoric of “violence” hides the real issue which is coercion and long-term abuse. Stark:

Evan Stark, [Professor of Human Services and Chair, Department of Urban Health Administration at Rutgers University], *Coercive Control: How Men Entrap Women in Personal Life*, Oxford University Press, 2007. BB

The coercive control model is built on earlier work that has remained marginal to mainstream intervention, a mountain of data that contradicts every major tenet of the domestic violence model; and a growing body of literature documenting the prevalence of tactics to isolate, intimidate and control women in abusive relationships. But its major source is the real-life experiences of perpetrators and victims of abuse As I’ve suggested, the most important anomalous evidence indicates that violence in abusive relationships is ongoing rather than episodic, that its effects are cumulative rather than incident-specific, and that the harms it causes are more readily explained by these factors than by its severity. Among these harms, the dominant approach identifies two for which it fails to adequately account, the entrapmentof victims in relationships where ongoing abuse is virtually inevitable, and the development of a problem profile that distinguishes abused women from every other class of assault victim. The prevailing view is that women stay and develop a range of mental health and behavioral problems because exposure to severe violence induces trauma-related syndromes, such as PTSD or BWS that can disable a woman’s capacity to cope or escape. In fact, however, only a small proportion of abuse victims evidence these syndromes. Most victims of abuse do not develop significant psychological or behavioral problems. Abused women exhibit a range of problems that are unrelated to trauma, the vast majority of assault incidents are too minor to induce trauma, and abuse victims can be entrapped even in the absence of assault. The duration of abusive relationships is made even more problematic when we appreciate that abuse victims are aggressive help seekers and are as likely to be assaulted and even entrapped when they are physically separated as when married or living together. Thus, whatever harms are involved can cross social space as well as extend over time and appear to persist regardless of how women respond. If violence doesn’t account for the entrapment of millions of women in personal life, what does? The answer is coercive control, a strategy that remains officially invisible despite the fact that it has been in plain sight at least since the earliest shelter residents told us in no uncertain terms that “violence wasn’t the worst part.” Cognitive psychologists in the late 1970s and 1980s tried to capture what these women were experiencing by comparing it to “coercive persuasion,” brainwashing, and other tactics used with hostages, prisoners of war, kidnap victims, and by pimps with prostitutes. Largely ignored by researchers, the understanding of abuse as coercive control was developed in popular literature and incorporated at least implicitly into how various practitioners approached the problem. Working on men’s control skills has provided one template for batterers programs since the founding of Emerge in Boston. Prosecutors are increasingly charging batterers with stalking, or harassment as well as domestic violence, crimes that typically involve a course of intimidating and controlling conduct as well of violence. Scotland and Canada are examples of countries that now define violence against women or abuse from a human rights perspective that includes a range of coercive and controlling behaviors in addition to assault. The most widely used graphic representation of abuse is the Power and Control Wheel introduced by the Domestic Violence Intervention Project (DAIP) in Duluth, Minnesota. Although violence is the hub of the original wheel, its spokes depict isolation, economic control, emotional and sexual abuse, and other facets of coercive control. This attention is merited. The several dozen studies that attempt to measure control and psychological abuse suggest that victims have been subjected to multiple control tactics, among which the denial of money, the monitoring of time, and restricted mobility and communication are prominent.

Calling it “domestic violence” means focus is only put on physical aspects- public polls prove. Klein et al:

Ethel Klein, [Former Professor at Harvard University], Jacquelyn Campbell, Esta Soler, Marissa Ghez, “Ending Domestic Violence: Changing Public Perceptions/Halting the Epidemic”, SAGE Publications Inc., 1997. RK

At the outset of our work, **physical, visible injury or threat of injury was where the public drew the line to divide abusive behavior from domestic violence**. In the 1992 EDK survey, **86% of respondents said that when a man hits a woman hard, his actions should no longer be a private matter. Slightly more than half of respondents were ready to insist on societal sanctions at that point, agreeing that he should be arrested** [53%] **or she should leave him** [53%]. Similarly, **the EDK poll showed that there was absolutely no doubt that a man had “crossed the line” if he punched a woman**. Nine out of ten [94%] respondents said that this was a public matter. Most people wanted to see a man arrested for this behavior [80%] and they wanted the victim to leave him [76%]. **To help clarify the public’s definition of domestic violence, EDK survey respondents were presented with a series of vignettes** identified as common situations: a woman screaming at or hitting her child at a mall; neighbors fighting; a fight at a family holiday meal; and a fight between a husband and wife. **They were then asked to assess whether the described circumstances constituted domestic violence** and whether the man should be arrested and the woman encouraged to leave. These vignettes compared similar circumstances involving different degrees of physical violence. We found that **people supported public intervention** [e.g., arrest for him or help for her to leave] **only in cases in which injury was explicit in the description**. The majority of EDK respondents felt that a mother screaming at her child was child abuse. If their daughter’s husband grabbed her and called her a worthless cow or their neighbors were fighting and screaming at the top of their lungs, they believed that these situations constituted domestic violence. However, in all three of these scenarios, respondents were not willing to impose strong sanctions. Only a few said that they would remove the child from the home [6%] and a small percentage would seek arrest for the screaming neighbor [10%] or the abusive husband [15%]; few men and women would tell their neighbor to leave their husband [15%] and less than half [41%] thought their daughter should leave the husband.

# AT They escape web of abuse by killing abuser

1. My arg is not specific to victims who kill- there are other victims who seek help from the CJS and your framing of language precludes that possibility; he’s going to say that’s not his advocacy but impacts don’t have to be topical as long as I’m proving a link
2. After they kill they’ll be tried for murder and unless the juries understand the oppressive nature of what happened, they’ll be found guilty- only my framing gives juries a background understanding of cumulative abuse to prevent that from happening

1. Helen Haste, [PhD of Psychology at the University of Bath], “Communitarianism and the Social Construction of Morality”, 1998. NC [↑](#footnote-ref-1)